arXiv:0901.1036v1 [math.FA] 8 Jan 2009

ON A CAPACITY FOR MODULAR SPACES

MARKUS BIEGERT

ABSTRACT. The purpose of this article is to define a capacity on certain topological measure spaces X with respect to certain function spaces V consisting of measurable functions. In this general theory we will not fix the space V but we emphasize that V can be the classical Sobolev space $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$, the classical Orlicz-Sobolev space $W^{1,\Phi}(\Omega)$, the Hajłasz-Sobolev space $M^{1,p}(\Omega)$, the Musielak-Orlicz-Sobolev space (or generalized Orlicz-Sobolev space) and many other spaces. Of particular interest is the space $V := \tilde{W}^{1,p}(\Omega)$ given as the closure of $W^{1,p}(\Omega) \cap C_c(\overline{\Omega})$ in $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$. In this case every function $u \in V$ (a priori defined only on Ω) has a trace on the boundary $\partial\Omega$ which is unique up to a $\mathrm{Cap}_{p,\Omega}$-polar set.

1. INTRODUCTION

The notion of capacity is fundamental to the analysis of pointwise behavior of Sobolev type functions. Depending on the starting point of the study, the capacity of a set can be defined in many appropriate ways. The Choquet theory [6] gives a standard approach to capacities. Capacity is a necessary tool in classical and nonlinear potential theory. One purpose of this article is to introduce an extension of the classical p-capacity which we call the *relative p-capacity*. For example, given an open set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ the classical p-capacity and the relative p-capacity can be used to decide whether a given function u lies in $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ or not. The notion of relative 2-capacity was first introduced by Wolfgang Arendt and Mahmadi Warma in [2] to study the Laplacian with general Robin boundary conditions on arbitrary domains in $\mathbb{R}^N$. For the investigation of the p-Laplacian with generalized Robin boundary conditions on bad domains, such as the snowflake (the domain bounded by the von Koch curve), the relative p-capacity plays an important role.

For results on the classical p-capacity and other capacities we refer the reader to the following books and the references therein: David R. Adams and Lars I. Hedberg [1], Nicolas Bouleau and Francis Hirsch [4], Gustave Choquet [6], Lawrence C. Evans and Ronald F. Gariepy [7], Juha Heinonen and Tero Kilpeläinen and Olli Martio [11], Jan Malý and William P. Ziemer [14] and Vladimir G. Maz'ya [15]. For capacities on Orlicz-Sobolev spaces and their fine behavior we refer to a recent article of J. Malý, D. Swanson and W. P. Ziemer [13] and the references therein.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Setting.

Definition 2.1 (Type Λ)**.** *Let V be a real vector space. We will call a mapping $\rho : V \to [0,\infty]$ a* Luxemburg functional *on V and $V = (V,\rho)$ a* Luxemburg space *if*

(M3) $\rho(\mathsf{u}) = 0$ *if and only if* $\mathsf{u} = 0$*;*
(M2) $\rho(-\mathsf{u}) = \rho(\mathsf{u})$ *for all* $\mathsf{u} \in V$*;*

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 31B15.
Key words and phrases. Relative Capacity, Traces of Sobolev type functions.

(M3) $\rho(\alpha \mathsf{u}+\beta \mathsf{v}) \leq \alpha\rho(\mathsf{u})+\beta\rho(\mathsf{v})$ *whenever* $\alpha+\beta=1$, $\alpha,\beta \geq 0$ *and* $\mathsf{u},\mathsf{v} \in V$*;*
(M4) $\lim_{\lambda\to 0+}\rho(\lambda \mathsf{u})=0$ *for all* $\mathsf{u}\in V$*;*

A Luxemburg space (V,ρ) *is endowed with the* Luxemburg norm $\|\cdot\|_V$ *given by*

$$\|\mathsf{u}\|_V := \inf\{\alpha>0 : \rho(\mathsf{u}/\alpha)\leq 1\}.$$

See [16, Theorem 1.5]. *If in addition*

(L1) $\rho : (V,\|\cdot\|_V)\to\mathbb{R}_+ := [0,\infty)$ *is continuous;*
(L2) $\lim_{\|\mathsf{u}\|_V\to\infty}\rho(\mathsf{u})=\infty$*;*
(L3) $\lim_{\rho(\mathsf{u})\to 0}\|\mathsf{u}\|_V=0$*;*

then we say that (V,ρ) *is of type* Λ*. A Luxemburg space* (V,ρ) *is called reflexive/complete if* V *with respect to the Luxemburg norm is reflexive/complete.*

Remark 2.2. *If* (V,ρ) *is a Luxemburg space, then* $\rho(\mathsf{u})\leq\|\mathsf{u}\|_V$ *for all* $\mathsf{u}\in V$ *with* $\|\mathsf{u}\|_V<1$ [16, Theorem 1.5(III)]. *If in addition* ρ *is continuous [see property (L1)], then* $\rho(\mathsf{u}/\|\mathsf{u}\|_V)=1$ *for all* $\mathsf{u}\in V\setminus\{0\}$*. Moreover,* ρ *is weakly lower-semicontinuous* [5, Corollary III.8], *in particular,*

$$\rho(\mathsf{u})\leq\liminf_{\mathsf{u}_n\rightharpoonup\mathsf{u}}\rho(\mathsf{u}_n).$$

If $(V,\|\cdot\|_1)$ *is a real normed vector space, then* $\rho(\mathsf{u}):=\|\mathsf{u}\|_1$ *is a Luxemburg functional on* V*,* (V,ρ) *is a Luxemburg space of type* Λ *and the Luxemburg norm* $\|\cdot\|_V$ *is equal to* $\|\cdot\|_1$*. So completeness and reflexivity of a Luxemburg space of type* Λ *is not automatic.*

Definition 2.3 (Type Θ)**.** *By a* topological measure space *(abbreviated by* tms*) we mean the quadruple* (X,τ,Σ,μ) *where* (X,τ) *is a topological space and* (X,Σ,μ) *a measure space. We will say that a topological measure space* X *is of* type Θ *if*

(M1) (X,τ) *is a Hausdorff topological space;*
(M2) (X,Σ,μ) *is a complete measure space;*
(M3) *If* $U\subset X$ *is open and* Σ*-measurable with* $\mu(U)=0$*, then* $U=\emptyset$*;*
(M4) *Every open set* $U\subset X$ *is the countable union of compact sets.*

Remark 2.4. *If* $X=(X,\tau,\Sigma,\mu)$ *is of type* Θ*,* $f,g\in C(X)$ *are measurable and* $f=g$ μ*-a.e. on* X*, then* $f=g$ *everywhere on* X*.*

Definition 2.5 (Domination of type Θ)**.** *For* $j=1,2$ *let* $X_j=(X_j,\tau_j,\Sigma_j,\mu_j)$ *be tms of type* Θ*. We will say that* X_2 *dominates* X_1*, abbreviated by* $X_1\preceq X_2$*, if*

(D1) $X_1\in\Sigma_2$ *and* $\Sigma_1=\Sigma_2\cap X_1=\{M\cap X_1 : M\in\Sigma_2\}$*;*
(D2) $\tau_1=\tau_2\cap X_1=\{O_2\cap X_1 : O_2\in\tau_2\}$*;*
(D3) $\mu_1(A)\leq\mu_2(A)$ *for all* $A\in\Sigma_1$*.*

Example 2.6. *Let* $\Omega_1\subset\Omega_2$ *be two non-empty open sets in* $\mathbb{R}^N$*,* λ *be the* N*-dimensional Lebesgue measure and* Σ *be the* σ*-algebra of all Lebesgue-measurable sets in* $\mathbb{R}^N$*.*

(1) *For* $j=1,2$ *we let* $X_j:=\Omega_j$*,* $\tau_j:=\tau_{\mathbb{R}^N}\cap X_j$*,* $\Sigma_j:=\Sigma\cap X_j$ *and define the measure* μ_j *on* (X_j,Σ_j) *by* $\mu_j(B):=\lambda(B\cap X_j)$*. Then* $(X_j,\tau_j,\Sigma_j,\mu_j)$ *is a tms of type* Θ *and* $X_1\preceq X_2$*.*
(2) *For* $j=1,2$ *we let* $X_j:=\overline{\Omega}_j$*,* $\tau_j:=\tau_{\mathbb{R}^N}\cap X_j$*,* $\Sigma_j:=\Sigma\cap X_j$ *and define the measure* μ_j *on* (X_j,Σ_j) *by* $\mu_j(B):=\lambda(B\cap X_j)$*. Then* $(X_j,\tau_j,\Sigma_j,\mu_j)$ *is a tms of type* Θ *and* $X_1\preceq X_2$*.*

Definition 2.7 (Class Υ)**.** *Let* $X=(X,\tau,\Sigma,\mu)$ *be a tms of type* Θ *and denote by* $L^0(X)$ *the vector space of all real-valued (equivalence classes of* μ*-a.e. equal) measurable functions on* X*. A subspace* $V\subset L^0(X)$ *equipped with a Luxemburg functional* ρ *belongs to the* class $\Upsilon=\Upsilon(X,\tau,\Sigma,\mu)$*, briefly* $V\in\Upsilon$*, if it satisfies the following properties.*

(V1) *(V,ρ) is a reflexive and complete Luxemburg space of type Λ;*
(V2) *The space $V\cap C_c(X)$ is dense in V;*
(V3) *If $\mathsf{u}_n,\mathsf{u}\in V$ and $\mathsf{u}_n\to\mathsf{u}$ then a subsequence of $(\mathsf{u}_n)_n$ converges μ-a.e. to u;*
(V4) *V is a vector lattice with respect to the μ-a.e. pointwise ordering;*
(V5) *The function $\mathsf{u}\wedge c$ belongs to V for every $\mathsf{u}\in V$ and $c\in\mathbb{R}_+$ and $\rho(\mathsf{u}\wedge c)\le\rho(\mathsf{u})$;*
(V6) *For every $c\in\mathbb{R}_+$ the mapping $V\to V$, $\mathsf{u}\mapsto\mathsf{u}\wedge c$ is continuous.*

Remark 2.8. *From property (V5) we get that $\rho(\mathsf{u}^+)\le\rho(\mathsf{u})$ for all $\mathsf{u}\in V$. This implies that $\|\mathsf{u}^+\|_V\le\|\mathsf{u}\|_V$. Similarly, we get that $\rho(\mathsf{u}^-)=\rho((-\mathsf{u})^+)\le\rho(-\mathsf{u})=\rho(\mathsf{u})$ and $\|\mathsf{u}^-\|_V\le\|\mathsf{u}\|_V$. Therefore*

$$\|\,|\mathsf{u}|\,\|_V=\|\mathsf{u}^++\mathsf{u}^-\|_V\le\|\mathsf{u}^+\|_V+\|\mathsf{u}^-\|_V\le\|\mathsf{u}\|_V+\|\mathsf{u}\|_V=2\|\mathsf{u}\|_V.$$

Definition 2.9 (Domination of class Υ). *For $j=1,2$ let X_j be a tms of type Θ and (V_j,ρ_j) of class $\Upsilon(X_j)$. Then we say that V_2* dominates *V_1, abbreviated by $V_1\preceq V_2$, if $X_1\preceq X_2$, $\mathsf{u}_2|_{X_1}\in V_1$ for all $\mathsf{u}_2\in V_2$ and there is a constant $c>0$ such that $\rho_1(\mathsf{u}_2|_{X_1})\le c\rho_2(\mathsf{u}_2)$ for all $\mathsf{u}_2\in V_2$.*

Example 2.10 (Sobolev spaces). *For $p\in(1,\infty)$ and $\Omega\subset\mathbb{R}^N$ open we let $W^{1,p}(\Omega)\subset L^p(\Omega)$ be the first order* Sobolev space *consisting of all functions $\mathsf{u}\in L^p(\Omega)$ whose distributional derivatives of order one belong to $L^p(\Omega)$. Equipped with the norm $\|\cdot\|_{W^{1,p}(\Omega)}$ given by*

$$\|\mathsf{u}\|^p_{W^{1,p}(\Omega)}:=\|\mathsf{u}\|^p_{L^p(\Omega)}+\|\,|\nabla\mathsf{u}|\,\|^p_{L^p(\Omega)}$$

the space $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ is a reflexive Banach space. Let $V:=\tilde{W}^{1,p}(\Omega)$ be the closure of $W^{1,p}(\Omega)\cap C_c(\overline{\Omega})$ in $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ and $\rho_{1,p,\Omega}(\mathsf{u}):=\|\mathsf{u}\|_{W^{1,p}(\Omega)}$. Then $(V,\rho_{1,p,\Omega})$ is of class $\Upsilon(\overline{\Omega})$ where the tms $X:=\overline{\Omega}$ is as in Example 2.6(2). Moreover, if $\Omega_1\subset\Omega_2$ are non-empty open sets in $\mathbb{R}^N$ we get that $\tilde{W}^{1,p}(\Omega_1)\preceq\tilde{W}^{1,p}(\Omega_2)$.

Definition 2.11 ($\mathscr{N}$-function). *A mapping $\Phi:\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}_+$ is called an $\mathscr{N}$-function if*

(N1) *Φ is even and convex;*
(N2) *$\Phi(x)=0$ if and only if $x=0$;*
(N3) *$\lim\limits_{x\to0+}x^{-1}\Phi(x)=0$ and $\lim\limits_{x\to\infty}x^{-1}\Phi(x)=\infty$.*

Let $\Psi:\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}_+$ be given by $\Psi(y):=\sup\{x|y|-\Phi(x):x\ge0\}$. Then Ψ is an $\mathscr{N}$-function, called the complementary $\mathscr{N}$-function *to Φ.*

Definition 2.12 (The $\triangle_2$- and ∇_2-condition). *An $\mathscr{N}$-function Φ is said to obey the global* $\triangle_2$-condition *if there exists a constant $C>2$ such that $\Phi(2x)\le C\cdot\Phi(x)$ for all $x\in\mathbb{R}$, abbreviated by $\Phi\in\triangle_2$. We say that Φ obeys the global* ∇_2-condition *if the complementary $\mathscr{N}$-function Ψ obeys the global $\triangle_2$-condition, abbreviated by $\Phi\in\nabla_2$. Note that $\Phi\in\nabla_2$ if and only if there exists a constant $c>1$ such that $\Phi(x)\le(2c)^{-1}\Phi(cx)$ for all $x\in\mathbb{R}$* [18, Theorem 1.1.2, p.3].

Example 2.13. *For $p\in(1,\infty)$ the function $\Phi_p:\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}_+$ defined by $\Phi_p(x):=|x|^p/p$ is an $\mathscr{N}$-function and $\Phi_p\in\triangle_2\cap\nabla_2$. Moreover, the complementary $\mathscr{N}$-function to Φ_p is Φ_q where $q\in(1,\infty)$ is given by $1/p+1/q=1$. q is called the* conjugate index *to p.*

Definition 2.14 (Orlicz-Space). *Let Φ be an $\mathscr{N}$-function and (X,Σ,μ) be a measure space. Then the Orlicz space $L^\Phi(X)=L^\Phi(X,\Sigma,\mu)$ is given by*

$$L^\Phi(X):=\left\{\mathsf{u}\in L^0(X):\rho_\Phi(\mathsf{u}/\alpha)<\infty\text{ for some }\alpha>0\right\}$$

where ρ_Φ is the Luxemburg functional given by $\rho_\Phi(\mathsf{u}):=\int_X\Phi(\mathsf{u})\,d\mu$. The space $L^\Phi(X)$ endowed with the Luxemburg norm $\|\cdot\|_\Phi$ is a Banach space [17, Theorem 3.3.10, p.67].

If in addition $\Phi \in \Delta_2 \cap \nabla_2$, then $L^\Phi(X)$ is reflexive [17, Theorem 4.2.10, p.112]. *For reflexivity/p-convexity of Musielak-Orlicz spaces see* [12]. *Moreover, we have that $\|fg\|_{L^1} \leq 2\|f\|_\Phi \|g\|_\Psi$ where Φ and Ψ are complementary $\mathscr{N}$-functions.*

Example 2.15 (Orlicz-Sobolev spaces)**.** *For an $\mathscr{N}$-function Φ and an open set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ we let $W^{1,\Phi}(\Omega) \subset L^\Phi(\Omega) \subset L^1_{\text{loc}}(\Omega)$ be the first order* Orlicz-Sobolev space *consisting of all functions* u *in the Orlicz space $L^\Phi(\Omega)$ whose distributional derivatives of order one belong to $L^\Phi(\Omega)$. Then the Orlicz-Sobolev space $W^{1,\Phi}(\Omega)$ is a Banach space for the Luxemburg norm $\|\cdot\|_{1,\Phi}$ associated to the Luxemburg functional*

$$\rho_{1,\Phi,\Omega}(\mathsf{u}) := \int_X \Phi(\mathsf{u}) + \Phi(|\nabla \mathsf{u}|)\, d\lambda$$

If in addition $\Phi \in \triangle_2 \cap \nabla_2$, then $W^{1,\Phi}(\Omega)$ is a reflexive Luxemburg space of type Λ:

- *For property (L1) see Rao and Ren* [17, Theorem 3.4.12, p.52 and Corollary 3.4.15]*;*
- *For property (L2) see Rao and Ren* [17, Corollary 5.3.4(iii), p.174]*;*
- *For property (L3) see Rao and Ren* [18, Theorem 1.2.7(iii), p.16]*;*
- *For reflexivity: First check that $\|\cdot\|$ given by $\|\mathsf{u}\| := \sum_{|\alpha|\leq 1} \|D^\alpha \mathsf{u}\|_\Phi$ is equivalent to $\|\cdot\|_{1,\Phi}$ and then identify $(W^{1,\Phi}(\Omega), \|\cdot\|)$ with a closed subspace of $(L^\Phi(\Omega))^{N+1}$.*

Let $V := \tilde{W}^{1,\Phi}(\Omega)$ be the closure of $C_c(\overline{\Omega}) \cap W^{1,\Phi}(\Omega)$ in $W^{1,\Phi}(\Omega)$. Then $(V, \rho_{1,\Phi,\Omega})$ is of class $\Upsilon(\overline{\Omega})$ where the tms $X := \overline{\Omega}$ is as in Example 2.6(2). Moreover, if $\Omega_1 \subset \Omega_2$ are non-empty open set in $\mathbb{R}^N$, then $\tilde{W}^{1,\Phi}(\Omega_1) \preceq \tilde{W}^{1,\Phi}(\Omega_2)$.

Definition 2.16 (V-Admissibility)**.** *Let (V,ρ) be of class Υ. We call a continuous and bijective function $\psi : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+$* V-admissible *if*

(A1) *For all $C > 0$ there exists $K(C) > 0$ such that $\psi(Ca) \leq K(C)\psi(a)$ for all $a > 0$;*
(A2) *For all $\mathsf{u},\mathsf{v} \in V$ it holds true that $(\psi\circ\rho)(\mathsf{u}\vee\mathsf{v}) \leq (\psi\circ\rho)(\mathsf{u}) + (\psi\circ\rho)(\mathsf{v})$.*

We will call a V-admissible function ψ strongly V-admissible *if for all $\mathsf{u},\mathsf{v} \in V$*

$$(\psi\circ\rho)(\mathsf{u}\vee\mathsf{v}) + (\psi\circ\rho)(\mathsf{u}\wedge\mathsf{v}) \leq (\psi\circ\rho)(\mathsf{u}) + (\psi\circ\rho)(\mathsf{v})$$

Example 2.17. *With the assumptions and notations of Example 2.10 and $\psi(x) := x^p$ we get that ψ is strongly $\tilde{W}^{1,p}(\Omega)$-admissible. In fact, let $\mathsf{u}_1,\mathsf{u}_2 \in \tilde{W}^{1,p}(\Omega)$. By considering the disjoint sets $D_1 := \{x \in \Omega : \mathsf{u}_1(x) < \mathsf{u}_2(x)\}$, $D_2 := \{x \in \Omega : \mathsf{u}_1(x) > \mathsf{u}_2(x)\}$ and $D_3 := \{x \in \Omega : \mathsf{u}_1(x) = \mathsf{u}_2(x)\}$ we get from Stampacchia's Lemma*

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathsf{u}_1\vee\mathsf{u}_2\|^p_{W^{1,p}(\Omega)} &= \int_{D_1} |\mathsf{u}_2|^p + |\nabla\mathsf{u}_2|^p + \int_{D_2} |\mathsf{u}_1|^p + |\nabla\mathsf{u}_1|^p + \int_{D_3} |\mathsf{u}_1|^p + |\nabla\mathsf{u}_1|^p \\
\|\mathsf{u}_1\wedge\mathsf{u}_2\|^p_{W^{1,p}(\Omega)} &= \int_{D_1} |\mathsf{u}_1|^p + |\nabla\mathsf{u}_1|^p + \int_{D_2} |\mathsf{u}_2|^p + |\nabla\mathsf{u}_2|^p + \int_{D_3} |\mathsf{u}_2|^p + |\nabla\mathsf{u}_2|^p.
\end{aligned}$$

From this we deduce that

$$\psi(\|\mathsf{u}_1\vee\mathsf{u}_2\|_{W^{1,p}(\Omega)}) + \psi(\|\mathsf{u}_1\wedge\mathsf{u}_2\|_{W^{1,p}(\Omega)}) = \psi(\|\mathsf{u}_1\|_{W^{1,p}(\Omega)}) + \psi(\|\mathsf{u}_2\|_{W^{1,p}(\Omega)}).$$

Example 2.18. *With the assumptions and notations from Example 2.15 and $\psi(x) := x$ we get that ψ is strongly $\tilde{W}^{1,\Phi}(\Omega)$-admissible. In fact, let $\mathsf{u}_1,\mathsf{u}_2 \in \tilde{W}^{1,\Phi}(\Omega)$. By considering the disjoint sets $D_1 := \{x \in \Omega : \mathsf{u}_1(x) < \mathsf{u}_2(x)\}$, $D_2 := \{x \in \Omega : \mathsf{u}_1(x) > \mathsf{u}_2(x)\}$ and $D_3 := \{x \in \Omega : \mathsf{u}_1(x) = \mathsf{u}_2(x)\}$ we get from Stampacchia's Lemma*

$$\rho_{1,\Phi}(\mathsf{u}_1\vee\mathsf{u}_2) = \int_{D_1} \Phi(\mathsf{u}_2) + \Phi(|\nabla\mathsf{u}_2|) + \int_{D_2} \Phi(\mathsf{u}_1) + \Phi(|\nabla\mathsf{u}_1|) + \int_{D_3} \Phi(\mathsf{u}_1) + \Phi(|\nabla\mathsf{u}_1|)$$

$$\rho_{1,\Phi}(\mathsf{u}_1\wedge \mathsf{u}_2) = \int_{D_1}\Phi(\mathsf{u}_1)+\Phi(|\nabla \mathsf{u}_1|) + \int_{D_2}\Phi(\mathsf{u}_2)+\Phi(|\nabla\mathsf{u}_2|)+\int_{D_3}\Phi(\mathsf{u}_2)+\Phi(|\nabla \mathsf{u}_2|).$$

From this we deduce that $\rho_{1,\Phi,\Omega}(\mathsf{u}_1\vee\mathsf{u}_2)+\rho_{1,\Phi,\Omega}(\mathsf{u}_1\wedge\mathsf{u}_2)=\rho_{1,\Phi,\Omega}(\mathsf{u}_1)+\rho_{1,\Phi,\Omega}(\mathsf{u}_2)$.

Definition 2.19 (Cutoff-Property)**.** *Let* (V,ρ) *be of class* Υ*,* $K\subset X$ *compact and* $U\subset X$ *open containing* K*. A function* $\eta\in V\cap C_c(U)$ *is called a* (K,U)-cutoff function *if*

- (K1) $\eta\equiv 1$ *on* K *and* $0\le\eta\le 1$ *on* X*;*
- (K2) *The mapping* $V\to V$*,* $\mathsf{u}\mapsto\eta\mathsf{u}$ *is well-defined and continuous;*
- (K3) *There exists a constant* $C>0$ *such that* $\rho(\eta\mathsf{u})\le C\cdot\rho(\mathsf{u})$ *for all* $\mathsf{u}\in V$.

We say that a space V *of class* Υ *satisfies the* cutoff-property *if for every compact set* K *and for every open set* U *containing* K *there exists a* (K,U)*-cutoff function.*

Example 2.20. *Let* $\Omega\subset\mathbb{R}^N$*,* $X:=\overline{\Omega}$*,* U *an open set in the tms* X*, and* $K\subset U$ *compact. Then there exists an open set* O *in* $\mathbb{R}^N$ *such that* $U=O\cap X$ *and a test function* $\varphi\in\mathscr{D}(\mathbb{R}^N)=C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ *such that* $\varphi\equiv 1$ *on* K*,* $0\le\varphi\le 1$ *on* $\mathbb{R}^N$ *and* $\operatorname{supp}(\varphi)\subset O$*. We remark that if* $\mathsf{u}\in W^{1,1}_{\text{loc}}(\Omega)$ *and* $\varphi\in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$*, then* $\mathsf{u}\varphi\in W^{1,1}_{\text{loc}}(\Omega)$ *and* $D_j(\mathsf{u}\varphi)=\varphi D_j\mathsf{u}+\mathsf{u}D_j\varphi$ *in* $\mathscr{D}(\Omega)'$*. This show that* $|\varphi\mathsf{u}|\le\|\varphi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}|\mathsf{u}|$ *and*

$$|D_j(\varphi\mathsf{u})|\le\|\varphi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}\left|D_j\mathsf{u}\right|+\|D_j\varphi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}|\mathsf{u}|\Rightarrow|\nabla(\varphi\mathsf{u})|\le C_1\left(|\nabla u|+|u|\right)$$

for some constant $C_1=C_1(\varphi,N)>0$*. Hence, using that* $\Phi\in\triangle_2$*, we get*

$$\int_\Omega\Phi(\varphi\mathsf{u})+\Phi(|\nabla\varphi\mathsf{u}|)\,dx\le C_2\int_\Omega\Phi(\mathsf{u})+\Phi(|\nabla u|).$$

This shows that for $\Phi\in\triangle_2\cap\nabla_2$ *we get that* $\tilde{W}^{1,\Phi}(\Omega)\in\Upsilon(\overline{\Omega})$ *has the cutoff-property. Similarly, we get that for* $p\in(1,\infty)$ *the Sobolev* $W^{1,p}(\Omega)\in\Upsilon(\overline{\Omega})$ *has the cutoff-property.*

2.2. **The Υ-Capacity.**

Definition 2.21 (Choquet Capacity)**.** *Let* (X,τ) *be a topological space and let* $\mathscr{K}$ *denote the collection of all compact sets in* X*. Then a mapping* C *from the power set* $\mathscr{P}(X)$ *of* X *into* $[-\infty,\infty]$ *is called a* Choquet capacity *on the paved space* $(X,\mathscr{K})$ *if*

- (C1) *If* $A_1\subset A_2\subset X$*, then* $\mathsf{C}(A_1)\le\mathsf{C}(A_2)$*;*
- (C2) *If* $(A_n)_n\subset X$ *is increasing and* $A=\bigcup_n A_n$*, then* $\lim_n\mathsf{C}(A_n)=\mathsf{C}(A)$*;*
- (C3) $K_n\in\mathscr{K}$ *is decreasing and* $K=\bigcap_n K_n$*, then* $\lim_n\mathsf{C}(K_n)=\mathsf{C}(K)$.

We will call a Choquet capacity C *normed, if* $\mathsf{C}(\emptyset)=0$.

Definition 2.22. *Let* V *be of class* Υ *and* ψ *be a* V*-admissible function. Then we define the* Υ-capacity $\operatorname{Cap}_{\psi,V}$ *of an arbitrary set* $A\subset X$ *by*

$$\operatorname{Cap}_{\psi,V}(A):=\inf\{(\psi\circ\rho)(\mathsf{u}):\mathsf{u}\in\mathscr{Y}_V(A)\}$$

where $\mathscr{Y}_V(A):=\{\mathsf{u}\in V:\exists O$ *open in* $X, A\subset O,\mathsf{u}\ge 1$ μ*-a.e. on* $O\}$*. When* $\Phi\in\triangle_2\cap\nabla_2$ *is an* $\mathscr{N}$*-function, then we call the capacity* $\operatorname{Cap}_{\Phi,\Omega}:=\operatorname{Cap}_{\psi,V}$ *the* relative Φ-capacity *where* $\psi(x):=x$ *and* $V:=\tilde{W}^{1,\Phi}(\Omega)$*. When* $p\in(1,\infty)$ *then we call the capacity* $\operatorname{Cap}_{p,\Omega}:=\operatorname{Cap}_{\psi,V}$ *the* relative p-capacity *where* $\psi(x):=|x|^p$ *and* $V:=\tilde{W}^{1,p}(\Omega)$*. Note that when* $\Omega=\mathbb{R}^N$*, then* $\operatorname{Cap}_p:=\operatorname{Cap}_{p,\Omega}=\operatorname{Cap}_{p,\mathbb{R}^N}$ *is the classical* p*-capacity.*

3. PROPERTIES OF THE Υ-CAPACITY

3.1. **Elementary Properties.** In this subsection we assume that (V,ρ) is of class Υ and ψ is V-admissible.

Lemma 3.1. *For every open set* $O\subset X$ *the set* $\mathscr{Y}_V(O)$ *is convex and (weakly) closed in* V.

Proof. Since $\mathscr{Y}_V(O) = \{\mathsf{u} \in V : \mathsf{u} \geq 1 \ \mu\text{-a.e. on } O\}$ convexity is clear. That $\mathscr{Y}_V(O)$ is closed follows from property (V3). □

Proposition 3.2. *Let $O \subset X$ be an open set with $\operatorname{Cap}_{\psi,V}(O) < \infty$. Then there exists a function $\mathsf{u} \in \mathscr{Y}_V(O)$ such that $\operatorname{Cap}_{\psi,V}(O) = \psi(\rho(\mathsf{u}))$, $\mathsf{u} = 1$ μ-a.e. on O and $0 \leq \mathsf{u} \leq 1$ μ-a.e. on X. If in addition ρ is strictly convex, then u is unique.*

Proof. Let $\mathsf{u}_n \in V$ be such that $\psi(\rho(\mathsf{u}_n)) \to \operatorname{Cap}_{\psi,V}(O) =: \psi(c)$. Then $(\mathsf{u}_n)_n$ is a bounded sequence in V [property (L2)]. Since V is reflexive, by possibly passing to a subsequence, we may assume that $(\mathsf{u}_n)_n$ converges weakly to a function $\mathsf{v} \in V$. Using Lemma 3.1 and Remark 2.2 we get that $\mathsf{v} \in \mathscr{Y}_V(O)$ and $\operatorname{Cap}_{\psi,V}(O) = \psi(\rho(\mathsf{v}))$. Now let $\mathsf{u} := (\mathsf{v} \wedge 1)^+$. Then $\mathsf{u} \in \mathscr{Y}_V(O)$ and $\rho(\mathsf{u}) \leq \rho(\mathsf{v})$ and hence $\rho(\mathsf{u}) = \rho(\mathsf{v})$ and therefore $\operatorname{Cap}_{\psi,V}(O) = \psi(\rho(\mathsf{u}))$. If ρ is strictly convex we get, using that ψ is strictly increasing, uniqueness of the minimizer u. □

Theorem 3.3. *The Υ-capacity $\operatorname{Cap}_{\psi,V}$ is a normed Choquet capacity on X and for every $A \subset X$ we have that*

$$\operatorname{Cap}_{\psi,V}(A) = \inf\{\operatorname{Cap}_{\psi,V}(O) : O \subset X \text{ open and } A \subset O\}. \tag{1}$$

Proof. Equation (1), $\operatorname{Cap}_{\psi,V}(\emptyset) = 0$ and $A \subset B \subset X \Rightarrow \operatorname{Cap}_{\psi,V}(A) \leq \operatorname{Cap}_{\psi,V}(B)$ are direct consequences of Definition 2.22.

Now let $(K_n)_n$ be a decreasing sequence of compact subsets in X and denote by K the intersection of all K_n. If $O \subset X$ is open and contains K, then there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $K_n \subset O$ for all $n \geq n_0$ [property (M1)]. Hence $\operatorname{Cap}_{\psi,V}(K) \leq \lim_n \operatorname{Cap}_{\psi,V}(K_n) \leq \operatorname{Cap}_{\psi,V}(O)$. Taking the infimum over all open sets O in X containing K we get from Equation (1) that $\operatorname{Cap}_{p,\Omega}(K) = \lim_n \operatorname{Cap}_{p,\Omega}(K_n)$.

Now let $(A_n)_n$ be an increasing sequence of subsets of X and denote by A the union of all A_n. Let $s := \lim_n \operatorname{Cap}_{\psi,V}(A_n) \leq \operatorname{Cap}_{\psi,V}(A) \in [0,\infty]$. To get the converse inequality we may assume that $s < \infty$ we and let $\mathsf{u}_n \in \mathscr{Y}_V(A_n)$ be such that $(\psi \circ \rho)(\mathsf{u}_n) \leq \operatorname{Cap}_{\psi,V}(A_n) + 1/n$. Therefore $(\mathsf{u}_n)_n$ is a bounded sequence in the reflexive Banach space V and hence has a weakly convergent subsequence. Let $\mathsf{u} \in V$ denote the weak limit of this subsequence. By Mazur's lemma there is a sequence $(\mathsf{v}_j)_j$ consisting of convex combinations of the u_n with $n \geq j$ which converges strongly to u. By the convexity of ρ we get that

$$\rho(\mathsf{v}_j) \leq \sup_{n \geq j} \rho(\mathsf{u}_n) \leq \psi^{-1}(s) + 1/j.$$

Since $\mathsf{u}_n \geq 1$ μ-a.e. on U_n for an open set U_n containing A_n we get that there exists an open set W_n (the finite intersection of U_j with $j \geq n$) containing A_n such that $\mathsf{v}_n \geq 1$ μ-a.e. on W_n. Since $(\mathsf{v}_j)_j$ converges to u we may assume, by possibly passing to a subsequence, that $\| \, |\mathsf{v}_{j+1} - \mathsf{v}_j| \, \|_V \leq 2^{-j}$. Let

$$\mathsf{w}_j := \mathsf{v}_j + \sum_{i=j}^{\infty} |\mathsf{v}_{i+1} - \mathsf{v}_i| \geq \mathsf{v}_j + \sum_{i=j}^{k-1} (\mathsf{v}_{i+1} - \mathsf{v}_i) = \mathsf{v}_k \quad \text{for } k \geq j.$$

Then $\mathsf{w}_j \in V$ and $\mathsf{w}_j \geq 1$ μ-a.e. on O_j where the open set O_j is given by $O_j := \bigcup_{i=j}^{\infty} W_i \supset A$. Since $\mathsf{w}_j \to \mathsf{u}$ and $\mathsf{v}_j \to \mathsf{u}$ in V we get using property (L1)

$$\operatorname{Cap}_{\psi,V}(A) \leq \lim_j \psi(\rho(\mathsf{w}_j)) = \psi(\rho(\mathsf{u})) = \lim_j \psi(\rho(\mathsf{v}_j)) \leq s = \lim_n \operatorname{Cap}_{\psi,V}(A_n).$$

□

Lemma 3.4. *If $A \subset X$ is $\operatorname{Cap}_{\psi,V}$-polar (Definition 3.21), that is, $\operatorname{Cap}_{\psi,V}(A) = 0$, then $\mu(A) = 0$.*

Proof. Let $\mathsf{u}_n \in \mathscr{Y}_V(A)$ be such that $\rho(\mathsf{u}_n) \to 0$. Then by property (L3)$\mathsf{u}_n \to 0$ in V. By possibly passing to a subsequence [property (V3)] we may assume that $\mathsf{u}_n \to 0$ μ-a.e. Since $\mathsf{u}_n \geq 1$ μ-a.e. on A we get that $\mu(A) = 0$. $\square$

Proposition 3.5. *Assume that V has the cutoff-property. Then for every compact set $K \subset X$ we have that*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}(K) &= \inf\{\psi(\rho(u)) : u \in V \cap C_c(X), u \geq 1 \textit{ on } K\} \\ &= \inf\{\psi(\rho(u)) : u \in V \cap C(X), u \geq 1 \textit{ on } K\}.\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Without loss of generality we may assume that $\mathscr{Y}_V(K) \neq \emptyset$. Let $\mathsf{u} \in \mathscr{Y}_V(K)$ be fixed. Then there exists an open set U containing K such that $\mathsf{v} := (\mathsf{u} \wedge 1)^+ = 1$ μ-a.e. on U. Let η be a (K,U)-cutoff function and let $(v_n)_n$ be a sequence in $V \cap C_c(X)$ which converges to v in V. Then $u_n := \eta + (1-\eta)v_n^+$ converges in V to $\eta + (1-\eta)\mathsf{v} = \eta\mathsf{v} + (1-\eta)\mathsf{v} = \mathsf{v}$ [properties (K2)+(V6)]. Using that $u_n \in V \cap C_c(X)$, $u_n \geq 1$ on K and $\rho(\mathsf{v}) \leq \rho(\mathsf{u})$ [property (V5)] we get that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}(K) &\geq \inf\{\psi(\rho(u)) : u \in V \cap C_c(X), u \geq 1 \text{ on } K\} \\ &\geq \inf\{\psi(\rho(u)) : u \in V \cap C(X), u \geq 1 \text{ on } K\}.\end{aligned}$$

For the converse inequality we fix a function $u \in V \cap C(X)$ such that $u \geq 1$ on K. Then $u_n := (1+1/n)u \in \mathscr{Y}_V(K)$ and hence $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}(K) \leq \psi(\rho(u_n)) \to \psi(\rho(u))$ [property (L1)]. $\square$

Theorem 3.6. *If ψ is strongly V-admissible, then the Υ-capacity is strongly subadditive, that is, for all $M_1, M_2 \subset X$*

$$\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}(M_1 \cup M_2) + \mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}(M_1 \cap M_2) \leq \mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}(M_1) + \mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}(M_2)$$

Proof. Let $\mathsf{u}_j \in \mathscr{Y}_V(M_j)$ for $j = 1,2$ and let $\mathsf{u} := \mathsf{u}_1 \vee \mathsf{u}_2$, $\mathsf{v} := \mathsf{u}_1 \wedge \mathsf{u}_2$. Then we have that $\mathsf{u} \in \mathscr{Y}_V(M_1 \cup M_2)$, $\mathsf{v} \in \mathscr{Y}_V(M_1 \cap M_2)$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}(M_1 \cup M_2) + \mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}(M_1 \cap M_2) &\leq \psi(\rho(\mathsf{u}_1 \vee \mathsf{u}_2)) + \psi(\rho(\mathsf{u}_1 \wedge \mathsf{u}_2)) \\ &\leq \psi(\rho(\mathsf{u}_1)) + \psi(\rho(\mathsf{u}_2)).\end{aligned}$$

Taking the infimum over all $\mathsf{u}_j \in \mathscr{Y}_V(M_1)$ the claim follows. $\square$

Theorem 3.7. *The Υ-capacity is subadditive, that is, for all $M_1, M_2 \subset X$*

$$\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}(M_1 \cup M_2) \leq \mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}(M_1) + \mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}(M_2)$$

Proof. The proof follows the lines in the proof of Theorem 3.6. Note that the Υ-capacity $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}$ is defined only for V-admissible ψ and that the V-admissibility of ψ was assumed at the beginning of this section. $\square$

Theorem 3.8. *The Υ-capacity $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}$ is countably subadditive, that is, for all $A_k \subset X$*

$$\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}\left(\bigcup\nolimits_{k\in\mathbb{N}} A_k\right) \leq \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}(A_k).$$

Proof. Let B_n be the union of A_k with $1 \leq k \leq n$ and let A be the union of all A_k. From Theorem 3.7 we get by induction that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}(B_n) \leq \sum_{k=1}^n \mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}(A_k)$. Using that $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}$ is a Choquet capacity [property (C2)] we get

$$\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}(A) = \lim_n \mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}(B_n) \leq \lim_n \sum_{k=1}^n \mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}(A_k) = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}(A_k).$$

$\square$

3.2. **Relations between Υ-Capacities.** In this subsection we assume that for $j = 1,2$ the tms $X_j = (X_j, \tau_j, \Sigma_j, \mu_j)$ is of type Θ, $X_1 \preceq X_2$, (V_j, ρ_j) is of class $\Upsilon(X_j)$, ψ_j is V_j-admissible. Moreover, for $1 \leq i, j \leq 2$ we let $\psi_{i,j} : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+$ be the bijective and continuous function given by $\psi_{i,j} := \psi_i \circ \psi_j^{-1}$.

Definition 3.9 ((V_1,V_2)-extension property)**.** *We will say that a set $U \subset X_1$ has the (V_1,V_2)-*extension property *if*

(X1) $\mu_1(N) = 0 \Rightarrow \mu_2(N) = 0$ *for all Σ_2-measurable sets $N \subset U$;*

(X2) *There exists a constant $c > 0$ and a mapping $\mathscr{E} : V_1^0(U) \to V_2$ where $V_1^0(U)$ is given by*

$$V_1^0(U) := \{ \mathsf{u} \in V_1 : \mathsf{u} = 0 \ \mu_1\text{-a.e. on } X_1 \setminus U \},$$

such that $\mathscr{E}\mathsf{u} = \mathsf{u}$ μ_1-a.e. on X_1 and $\rho_2(\mathscr{E}\mathsf{u}) \leq c\rho_1(\mathsf{u})$.

*We say that a set U in X_1 has the $\sigma(V_1,V_2)$-*extension property *if U is the countable union of open sets in X_1 satisfying the (V_1,V_2)-extension property.*

Example 3.10. *Let $\Omega_1 \subset \Omega_2$ be non-empty open sets in $\mathbb{R}^N$ and $U \subset\subset \Omega_1$ (this means U is open, $\overline{U}$ is compact and $\overline{U} \subset \Omega_1$).*

1. *If $1 < q \leq p < \infty$, then U has the $(\tilde{W}^{1,p}(\Omega_1), \tilde{W}^{1,q}(\Omega_2))$-extension property and hence Ω_1 has the $\sigma(\tilde{W}^{1,p}(\Omega_1), \tilde{W}^{1,q}(\Omega_2))$-extension property.*
2. *If $\Phi \in \triangle_2 \cap \nabla_2$ is an $\mathscr{N}$-function, then U has the $(\tilde{W}^{1,\Phi}(\Omega_1), \tilde{W}^{1,\Phi}(\Omega_2))$-extension property and hence Ω_1 has the $\sigma(\tilde{W}^{1,\Phi}(\Omega_1), \tilde{W}^{1,\Phi}(\Omega_2))$-extension property.*

Lemma 3.11. *Assume that U is open in X_1 and has the (V_1,V_2)-extension property, $K \subset U$ is compact and V_1 has the cutoff property. Then there exists a constant $C = C(K) > 0$ such that for all $A \subset K$*

$$\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi_2,V_2}(A) \leq \psi_{2,1}(C \cdot \mathrm{Cap}_{\psi_1,V_1}(A)).$$

In particular, when $\psi := \psi_1 = \psi_2$, then there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V_2}(A) \leq C \cdot \mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V_1}(A).$$

Proof. Let $\eta \in V_1 \cap C_c(U)$ be a (K,U)-cutoff function and $\mathsf{u} \in \mathscr{Y}_{V_1}(A)$ be fixed. Then $\eta\mathsf{u} \in V_1^0(U)$, $\mathsf{v} := \mathscr{E}(\eta\mathsf{u}) \in \mathscr{Y}_{V_2}(A)$ and hence [properties (K3)+(X2)]

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Cap}_{\psi_2,V_2}(A) &\leq (\psi_2 \circ \rho_2)(\mathsf{v}) \leq \psi_2(c_1\rho_1(\eta\mathsf{u})) \leq \psi_2(c_2\rho_1(\mathsf{u})) \\ &= \psi_{2,1}(\psi_1(c_2\rho_1(\mathsf{u}))) \leq \psi_{2,1}(C \cdot (\psi_1 \circ \rho_1)(\mathsf{u})). \end{aligned}$$

Taking the infimum over all $\mathsf{u} \in \mathscr{Y}_{\psi,V_1}(A)$ we get the claim. □

Example 3.12. *Let $\Omega_1 \subset \Omega_2$ be non-empty open sets in $\mathbb{R}^N$, $1 < q \leq p < \infty$ and let $K \subset \Omega_1$ be compact. Then there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $A \subset K$*

$$\mathrm{Cap}_{q,\Omega_2}(A) \leq C \cdot \mathrm{Cap}_{p,\Omega_1}(A)^{q/p}.$$

In fact, let $U \subset\subset \Omega_1$ be such that $K \subset U$. Then by Example 3.10(2) we get that all assumptions from Lemma 3.11 are satisfied.

Lemma 3.13. *If $V_1 \preceq V_2$ then there exists a $C > 0$ such that for all $A \subset X_1$*

$$\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi_1,V_1}(A) \leq \psi_{1,2}(C \cdot \mathrm{Cap}_{\psi_2,V_2}(A)). \tag{2}$$

Proof. Let $\mathsf{u} \in \mathscr{Y}_{V_2}(A)$. Then $\mathsf{u}|_{X_1} \in \mathscr{Y}_{V_1}(A)$ and $\rho_1(\mathsf{u}|_{X_1}) \leq c\rho_2(\mathsf{u})$ by Definition 2.9. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Cap}_{\psi_1,V_1}(A) &\leq (\psi_1 \circ \rho_1)(\mathsf{u}|_{X_1}) \leq \psi_1(c \cdot \rho_2(\mathsf{u})) \\ &= \psi_{1,2}(\psi_2(c \cdot \rho_2(\mathsf{u}))) \leq \psi_{1,2}(C \cdot (\psi_2 \circ \rho_2)(\mathsf{u})). \end{aligned}$$

Taking the infimum over all $\mathsf{u} \in \mathscr{Y}_{V_2}(A)$ we get the claim. ☐

Proposition 3.14. *Assume that U is an open set in X_1 and has the $\sigma(V_1,V_2)$-extension property, V_1 has the cutoff property and $V_1 \preceq V_2$. Then for every $A \subset U$ we have that*

$$\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi_1,V_1}(A) = 0 \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad \mathrm{Cap}_{\psi_2,V_2}(A) = 0. \tag{3}$$

Proof. From Equation (2) we get that $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi_2,V_2}(A) = 0$ implies that $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi_1,V_1}(A) = 0$. Hence to prove (3) it remains to prove the converse implication. For this let $U_m \subset X_1$ be open sets with the (V_1,V_2)-extension property such that $U = \bigcup_m U_m$ and let $K_{m,n} \subset U_m$ be compact sets such that $U_m = \bigcup_n K_{m,n}$ and assume that $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi_1,V_1}(A) = 0$. Then by Lemma 3.11 there exist constants $C_{n,m}$ such that

$$\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi_2,V_2}(K_{m,n} \cap A) \leq \psi_{2,1}(C_{m,n} \cdot \mathrm{Cap}_{\psi_1,V_1}(K_{m,n} \cap A)) = 0.$$

Using that $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi_2,V_2}$ is a countably subadditive [Theorem 3.8] and that $\bigcup_{n,m} K_{n,m} = U$ we get that

$$\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi_2,V_2}(A) \leq \sum_{m,n} \mathrm{Cap}_{\psi_2,V_2}(K_{n,m} \cap A) = 0.$$

☐

Corollary 3.15. *Let $\Omega_1 \subset \Omega_2$ be non-empty open sets in $\mathbb{R}^N$, $p \in (1,\infty)$ and $\Phi \in \triangle_2 \cap \nabla_2$ be an $\mathscr{N}$-function. Then for all sets in $A \subset \Omega_1$ we have that*

$$\mathrm{Cap}_{p,\Omega_1}(A) = 0 \Leftrightarrow \mathrm{Cap}_{p,\Omega_2}(A) = 0 \quad \textit{and} \quad \mathrm{Cap}_{\Phi,\Omega_1}(A) = 0 \Leftrightarrow \mathrm{Cap}_{\Phi,\Omega_2}(A) = 0.$$

Remark 3.16. *In general the assertion of Corollary 3.15 (and hence of Proposition 3.14) is untrue for $A \subset \overline{\Omega}_1$. To see this we let $N \geq 2$ and $\Omega := (0,1)^N \setminus \bigcup_{j\in\mathbb{N}} [2^{-2j}, 2^{1-2j}] \times [2^{-j},1] \times (0,1)^{N-2}$. Then the open set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ is bounded and connected and $A := \{0\} \times [0,1]^{n-1} \subset \partial\Omega$ is such that the $(N-1)$-dimensional Hausdorff measure $\mathscr{H}^{N-1}(A) = 1$. Then for every $p \in (1,\infty)$ we have that $\mathrm{Cap}_p(A) > 0$ and $\mathrm{Cap}_{p,\Omega}(A) = 0$.*

Definition 3.17 (Continuous Extension Property)**.** *We will say that V_1 has the* continuous V_2-extension property *if there exists a (possibly non-linear) mapping $\mathscr{E} : V_1 \to V_2$ and a constant $C = C(\mathscr{E})$ such that $\mathscr{E}(V_1 \cap C(X_1)) \subset V_2 \cap C(X_2)$ and for all $\mathsf{u}_1 \in V_1$ it holds true that $\rho_2(\mathscr{E}(\mathsf{u}_1)) \leq C\rho_1(\mathsf{u}_1)$ and $\mathscr{E}\mathsf{u}_1 = \mathsf{u}_1$ μ_1-a.e. on X_1.*

Definition 3.18. *Let $\Omega_1 \subset \Omega_2$ be non-empty open sets in $\mathbb{R}^N$ and $p \in (1,\infty)$. Then we say that $W^{1,p}(\Omega_1)$ has the $W^{1,p}(\Omega_2)$-*extension property *if the restriction $W^{1,p}(\Omega_2) \to W^{1,p}(\Omega_1)$, $\mathsf{u} \mapsto \mathsf{u}|_{\Omega_1}$ is surjective. If $\Omega_2 = \mathbb{R}^N$ and Ω_1 has the $W^{1,p}(\Omega_2)$-extension property, then we say briefly that Ω_1 has the $W^{1,p}$-*extension property.

The following is an immediate consequence of Shvartsman [19] and Hajłasz and Koskela and Tuominen [8].

Theorem 3.19. *Let $p \in (1,\infty)$ and $\Omega_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be a $W^{1,p}$-extension domain. Then Ω_1 has the continuous $W^{1,p}(\Omega_2)$-extension property for every open set $\Omega_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ containing Ω_1.*

Proof. Since Ω is a $(1,p)$-extension domain, we get from [8, Theorem 2 and Lemma 2.1] that there exists a constant $\delta_\Omega > 0$ such that $\lambda(B(x,r) \cap \Omega) \geq \delta_\Omega r^N$ for all $0 < r \leq 1$ and $\lambda(\partial\Omega) = 0$. For a measurable set $A \subset \mathbb{R}$ we let $M^{1,p}(A)$ be the Sobolev-type space introduced by Hajłasz consisting of those function $\mathsf{u} \in L^p(A)$ with generalized gradient in $L^p(A)$. It follows from [19, Theorem 1.3] that $M^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)|_{\overline{\Omega}} = M^{1,p}(\overline{\Omega})$ and that there exists a linear continuous extension operator $\mathscr{E} : M^{1,p}(\overline{\Omega}) \to M^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$. Using that $M^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^N) = W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ as sets with equivalent norms, we get that $M^{1,p}(\overline{\Omega}) = W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ are equal as sets with equivalent norms and hence the extension operator $\mathscr{E}$ constructed for $M^{1,p}(\overline{\Omega})$ is also a linear continuous extension operator from $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ into $W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$. It is left to the reader to verify that the extension operator $\mathscr{E}$ constructed by Shvartsman [19, Equation (1.5)] maps $W^{1,p}(\Omega)\cap C(\overline{\Omega})$ into $W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)\cap C(\mathbb{R}^N)$. $\square$

Theorem 3.20. *If $V_1 \preceq V_2$, V_1 has the continuous V_2-extension property and the cutoff property, then there exist constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that for every set $A \subset X_1$*

$$\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi_2,V_2}(A) \leq \psi_{2,1}[C_1 \cdot \mathrm{Cap}_{\psi_1,V_1}(A)] \leq \psi_{2,1}[C_1 \cdot \psi_{1,2}(C_2\,\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi_2,V_2}(A))].$$

Proof. Let $K \subset X_1$ be a compact set. By Proposition 3.5 there exist $u_n \in V_1 \cap C_c(X_1)$ such that $u_n \geq 1$ on K and $\psi_1(\rho_1(u_n)) \to \mathrm{Cap}_{\psi_1,V_1}(K)$. Let $\mathscr{E} : V_1 \to V_2$ be a continuous extension operator and define $v_n := \mathscr{E}u_n$. Then $v_n \in V_2 \cap C(X_2)$ and $v_n \geq 1$ on K. Hence by Proposition 3.5 we get that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi_2,V_2}(K) &\leq \psi_2(\rho_2(v_n)) \leq \psi_2(C(\mathscr{E})\rho_1(u_n)) = \psi_{2,1}(\psi_1(C(\mathscr{E})\rho_1(u_n)))\\
&\leq \psi_{2,1}(C(\mathscr{E},\psi_1)\psi_1(\rho_1(u_n))) \to \psi_{2,1}(C(\mathscr{E},\psi_1)\,\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi_1,V_1}(K)).
\end{aligned}$$

Let W be an open set in X_1. Then there exists an increasing sequence $(K_n)_n$ of compact sets such that $\bigcup_n K_n = W$ [property (M4)]. Using that $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi_1,V_1}$ and $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi_2,V_2}$ are Choquet capacities [property (C2)] we get that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi_2,V_2}(W) &= \lim_n \mathrm{Cap}_{\psi_2,V_2}(K_n) \leq \lim_n \psi_{2,1}(C(\mathscr{E},\psi_1)\,\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi_1,V_1}(K_n))\\
&= \psi_{2,1}(C(\mathscr{E},\psi)\,\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V_1}(W)).
\end{aligned}$$

Now let $A \subset X_1$ be arbitrary. Then by Theorem 3.3

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi_2,V_2}(A) &= \inf\{\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi_2,V_2}(O) : O \text{ is open in } X_2 \text{ and } A \subset O\}\\
&= \inf\{\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi_2,V_2}(O\cap X_1) : O \text{ is open in } X_2 \text{ and } A \subset O\}\\
&= \inf\{\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi_2,V_2}(W) : W \text{ is open in } X_1 \text{ and } A \subset W\}\\
&\leq \psi_{2,1}[C(\mathscr{E},\psi_1)\inf\{\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi_1,V_1}(W) : W \text{ is open in } X_1 \text{ and } A \subset W\}]\\
&= \psi_{2,1}[C(\mathscr{E},\psi)\,\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V_1}(A)].
\end{aligned}$$

The remaining inequality follows from Lemma 3.13. $\square$

3.3. **Quasicontinuity and Polar Sets.**

In this subsection we assume that the tms $X = (X,\tau,\Sigma,\mu)$ is of type Θ, (V,ρ) is of class $\Upsilon(X)$ and ψ is V-admissible. The purpose of this subsection is to prove existence and uniqueness of $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}$-quasi continuous representatives on X.

Definition 3.21. *A set $P \subset X$ is said to be* $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}$-polar *if* $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}(P) = 0$. *A pointwise defined function u on $\mathsf{D} \subset X$ is called* $\mathrm{Cap}_{p,\Omega}$-quasi continuous *on D if for each $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists an open set O in X with $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}(O) < \varepsilon$ such that u restricted to $\mathsf{D}\setminus O$ is continuous. We say that a property holds $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}$-quasi everywhere (briefly $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}$-q.e.) if it holds except for a $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}$-polar set.*

Lemma 3.22. *If $\mathsf{u} \in V$ and $u_k \in V \cap C_c(X)$ are such that*

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \psi(2^{k+2}\|\mathsf{u}-u_{k+1}\|_V + 2^{k+1}\,\|\mathsf{u}-u_k\|_V) < \infty,$$

then the pointwise limit $\tilde{u} := \lim_k u_k$ exists $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}$-quasi everywhere on X, $\tilde{u} : X \to \mathbb{R}$ is $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}$-quasi continuous and $\tilde{u} = \mathsf{u}$ μ-almost everywhere on X.

Proof. Let $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $2^k\|\mathsf{u}-u_k\|_V < 1/4$ for all $k \geq k_0$ and consider the open sets $G_k := \{x \in X : |u_{k+1}(x)-u_k(x)| > 2^{-k}\}$. Then $2^k \cdot |u_{k+1}-u_k| \geq 1$ on G_k and

$$\|u_{k+1}-u_k\|_V \leq \|\mathsf{u}-u_{k+1}\|_V + \|\mathsf{u}-u_k\|_V \leq 2\|\mathsf{u}-u_{k+1}\|_V + \|\mathsf{u}-u_k\|_V .$$

Therefore, if $k \geq k_0$, we get

$$\|\, 2^k|u_{k+1}-u_k|\, \|_V \leq \|2^{k+1}(u_{k+1}-u_k)\|_V \leq 2^{k+2}\, \|\mathsf{u}-u_{k+1}\|_V + 2^{k+1}\, \|\mathsf{u}-u_k\|_V < 1.$$

From this we deduce that (see Remark 2.2) for all $k \geq k_0$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}(G_k) &\leq \psi[\rho(2^k \cdot |u_{k+1}-u_k|)] \leq \psi(\|\, 2^k|u_{k+1}-u_k|\, \|_V) \\ &\leq \psi(2^{k+2}\, \|\mathsf{u}-u_{k+1}\|_V + 2^{k+1}\, \|\mathsf{u}-u_k\|_V) \end{aligned}$$

and hence $\sum_k \mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}(G_k) < \infty$. Given $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $k_1 \geq k_0$ such that $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}(G) < \varepsilon$ where $G := \bigcup_{k \geq k_1} G_k$. Since $|u_{k+1}-u_k| \leq 2^{-k}$ on $X \setminus G$ for all $k \geq k_1$ we have that $(u_k)_k$ is a sequence of continuous functions on X which converges uniformly on $X \setminus G$. Since $\varepsilon > 0$ was arbitrary we get that $\tilde{u} := \lim_k u_k$ exists $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}$-quasi everywhere on X and $\tilde{u}|_{X\setminus G}$ is continuous. To see that $\tilde{u}$ coincides with u μ-almost everywhere on X we argue as follows. Since $(u_k)_k$ converges to u, by possibly passing to a subsequence [property (V3)] we have that u_k converges to u μ-almost everywhere. Since $(u_k)_k$ converges to $\tilde{u}$ $\mathrm{Cap}_{p,\Omega}$-quasi everywhere on X (and hence μ-almost everywhere on X) we get that $\tilde{u} = \mathsf{u}$ μ-almost everywhere on X (see Lemma 3.4). ☐

Theorem 3.23. *For every* $\mathsf{u} \in V$ *there exists a* $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}$*-quasi continuous function* $\tilde{u} : X \to \mathbb{R}$ *such that* $\tilde{u} = \mathsf{u}$ μ*-a.e. on* X*, that is,* $\tilde{u} \in \mathsf{u}$.

Proof. Let $\mathsf{u} \in V$. Then by definition there exists a sequence $u_n \in V \cap C_c(X)$ such that $u_n \to \mathsf{u}$ in V. Then a subsequence of $(u_n)_n$ satisfies the assumptions of Lemma 3.22. ☐

Lemma 3.24. *Let* $A \subset X$, $\mathsf{u} \in V$ *be non-negative and let* $u \in \mathsf{u}$ *be a* $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}$*-quasi continuous version of* u *such that* $u \geq 1$ $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}$*-quasi everywhere on* A*. Then there is a sequence* $(\mathsf{u}_n)_n \subset \mathscr{Y}_V(A)$ *which converges to* u *in* V.

Proof. Let O_n be an open set in X such that $u|_{X\setminus O_n}$ is continuous, $u \geq 1$ everywhere on $A \setminus O_n$ and $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}(O) \leq 1/n$. Let v_n be a capacitary extremal for O_n (see Proposition 3.2) such that $0 \leq \mathsf{v}_n \leq 1$ μ-a.e. on X. Then we have that

$$\psi(\rho(\mathsf{v}_n)) = \mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}(O_n) \to 0 \Rightarrow \rho(\mathsf{v}_n) \to 0 \Rightarrow \mathsf{v}_n \to 0 \text{ in } V.$$

Let $\mathsf{w}_n := (1+1/n)u + \mathsf{v}_n \geq \mathsf{v}_n$. Then $\mathsf{w}_n \to \mathsf{u}$ in V. For the open set G_n in X given by

$$G_n := O_n \cup \{x \in X \setminus O_n : u(x) > n/(n+1)\}$$

we have that $\mathsf{w}_n \geq 1$ μ-a.e. on G_n and $A \subset G_n$ and hence $\mathsf{w}_n \in \mathscr{Y}_V(A)$. ☐

Lemma 3.25. *Let* $u \in \mathsf{u} \in V$ *be a* $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}$*-quasi continuous version of* u *and let* $a \in (0,\infty)$*. Then*

$$\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}(\{x \in X : u(x) > a\}) \leq \psi\,[\rho(\mathsf{u}/a)]$$

Proof. Let $A := \{x \in X : u(x) > a\}$. By Lemma 3.24 there exists a sequence $(\mathsf{u}_n)_n \in \mathscr{Y}_V(A)$ which converges to $a^{-1}\mathsf{u}^+$ in V. Note that u^+ is a $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}$-quasi continuous version of u^+. Hence

$$\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}(\{x \in X : u(x) > a\}) \leq \psi\,[\rho(\mathsf{u}_n)] \to \psi\left[\rho(\mathsf{u}^+/a)\right] \leq \psi\,[\rho(\mathsf{u}/a)]\,.$$

☐

Theorem 3.26. *Assume that V has the cutoff-property and let $\mathsf{u},\mathsf{v} \in V$ be such that $\mathsf{u} \le \mathsf{v}$ μ-a.e. on U where U is an open set in X. If $u \in \mathsf{u}$ and $v \in \mathsf{v}$ are $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}$-quasi continuous versions of u and v, respectively, then $u \le v$ $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}$-quasi everywhere on U.*

Proof. Let $(K_n)_n$ be a sequence of compact sets such that $U = \bigcup_n K_n$. For the sequence of compact sets we choose non-negative (K_n,U)-cutoff functions $\varphi_n \in V \cap C_c(U)$. Then the function $w_n := \varphi_n(u-v)^+ = 0$ μ-a.e. on X and we get by Lemma 3.25, using that $\varphi_n(u-v)^+$ is $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}$-quasi continuous, that $w_n = 0$ $\mathrm{Cap}_{p,\Omega}$-quasi everywhere on X and hence that $u \le v$ $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}$-quasi everywhere on K_n for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Since the countable union of $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}$-polar sets is $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}$-polar we get that $u \le v$ $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}$-quasi everywhere on U. □

Theorem 3.27. *Let $\mathsf{u} \in V$. Then there exists a unique (up to a $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}$-polar set) $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}$-quasi continuous function $\tilde{u} : X \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $\mathsf{u} = \tilde{u}$ μ-a.e. on Ω.*

Proof. The existence follows from Theorem 3.23. To show uniqueness we let $u_1, u_2 \in \mathsf{u} \in V$ be two quasi-continuous versions of u. Then $u_1 = u_2$ μ-a.e. on X and hence by Lemma 3.25 we get that $u_1 = u_2$ $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}$-quasi everywhere on X. □

Definition 3.28. *By $\mathscr{N}^\star(V,\rho)$ we denote the set of all $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}$-polar sets in X and we denote by $C(V,\rho)$ the space of all $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}$-quasi continuous functions $u : X \to \mathbb{R}$. Note that $\mathscr{N}^\star(V,\rho)$ and $C(V,\rho)$ do not depend on the V-admissible ψ. On $C(V,\rho)$ we define the equivalence relation $\sim$ by*

$$u \sim v \quad :\Leftrightarrow \quad \exists P \in \mathscr{N}^\star(V,\rho) : u = v \text{ everywhere on } X \setminus P.$$

For a function $u \in C(V,\rho)$ we denote by $[u]$ the equivalence class of u with respect to $\sim$. Now the refined space $\mathscr{V}$ is defined by $\mathscr{V} := \{\tilde{\mathsf{u}} : \mathsf{u} \in V\} \subset C(V,\rho)/\sim$ where $\tilde{\mathsf{u}} := [u]$ with $u \in \mathsf{u} \in V$ $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}$-quasi continuous. We equip $\mathscr{V}$ with the norm $\|\cdot\|_V$. Note that by Theorem 3.27 $\mathscr{V}$ is isometrically isomorphic to V. For a sequence $(\mathsf{u}_n)_n$ in $\mathscr{V}$ and $\mathsf{u} \in \mathscr{V}$ we say that $(\mathsf{u}_n)_n$ converges $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}$-quasi everywhere to u *if for every $u_n \in \mathsf{u}_n$ and $u \in \mathsf{u}$ there exists a $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}$-polar set P such that $u_n \to u$ everywhere on $X \setminus P$. We say that $(\mathsf{u}_n)_n$* converges $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}$-quasi uniformly to u *if for every $u_n \in \mathsf{u}_n$, $u \in \mathsf{u}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists an open set G in X such that $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}(G) \le \varepsilon$ and $u_n \to u$ uniformly (everywhere) on $X \setminus G$.*

Theorem 3.29. *If $\mathsf{u}_n \in \mathscr{V}$ converges to $\mathsf{u} \in \mathscr{V}$ in $\mathscr{V}$, then there exists a subsequence which converges $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}$-quasi everywhere and -quasi uniformly on X to u.*

Proof. By possibly passing to a subsequence we may assume that $\sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \psi[\rho(n|\mathsf{u}_n - \mathsf{u}|)] < \infty$. We show under the above assumption that $(\mathsf{u}_n)_n$ converges $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}$-quasi everywhere and -quasi uniformly on X to u. Let $u_n \in \mathsf{u}_n$ and $u \in \mathsf{u}$ be fixed and define

$$G_n := \left\{ x \in X : |u_n(x) - u(x)| > n^{-1} \right\}.$$

We show that $u_n(x) \to u(x)$ for all $x \in X \setminus P$ where $P := \bigcap_{j=1}^\infty \bigcup_{k=j}^\infty G_k$. If $x \in X \setminus P$ then there exists $j_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $x \notin \bigcup_{k=j_0}^\infty G_k$, that is, $|u_n(x) - u(x)| \le n^{-1}$ for all $n \ge j_0$ and hence $u_n \to u$ uniformly on $X \setminus \bigcup_{k=j_0}^\infty G_k \ni x$ and everywhere on $X \setminus P$. We show that P is a $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}$-polar set. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be given. Then there exists $N = N(\varepsilon)$ such that $\sum_{n=N}^\infty \psi[\rho(n|\mathsf{u}_n - \mathsf{u}|)] \le \varepsilon$. By Lemma 3.25 we get that

$$\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}\left(\bigcup\nolimits_{n\ge N} G_n\right) \le \sum_{n=N}^\infty \mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}(G_n) \le \sum_{n=N}^\infty \psi[\rho(n\cdot|\mathsf{u}_n - \mathsf{u}|)] \le \varepsilon.$$

Therefore $\mathrm{Cap}_{p,\Omega}(P) \le \varepsilon$ and since $\varepsilon > 0$ was arbitrary the claim follows. □

Lemma 3.30. *Let $U \subset X$ be a non-empty open set which is the countable union of open sets $\omega_n \subset U$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then a function $u : X \to \mathbb{R}$ is $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}$-quasi continuous on U if and only if u is $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}$-quasi continuous on every set ω_n.*

Proof. Assume that u is $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}$-quasi continuous on every set $\omega_n \subset U$ and let $\varepsilon > 0$ be given. Then there exists an open set $O_n \subset X$ such that $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}(O_n) \leq \varepsilon 2^{-n}$ and $u|_{\omega_n \setminus O_n}$ is continuous, that is, $u^{-1}(I) \cap (\omega_n \setminus O_n)$ is open in $\omega_n \setminus O_n$ for every open set $I \subset \mathbb{R}$. Let $O := \bigcup_n O_n$. Then $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}(O) \leq \sum_n \mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}(O_n) \leq \varepsilon$ and $u|_{U\setminus O}$ is continuous. In fact, using that $u^{-1} \cap (\omega_n \setminus O)$ is open in $\omega_n \setminus O$ and hence open in $U \setminus O$ we get that $u^{-1}(I) \cap (U \setminus O) = \bigcup_n u^{-1}(I) \cap (\omega_n \setminus O)$ is open in $U \setminus O$ for every open set $I \subset \mathbb{R}$, hence $u|_{U\setminus O}$ is continuous. ☐

Theorem 3.31. *For $j = 1, 2$ we let X_j be a tms of type Θ, V_j be of class $\Upsilon(X_j)$, ψ_j be V_j-admissible. If $U \subset X_1$ has the $\sigma(V_1,V_2)$-extension property, V_1 has the cutoff-property and $V_1 \preceq V_2$, then a function $u : U \to \mathbb{R}$ is $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi_1,V_1}$-quasi continuous on U if and only if it is $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi_2,V_2}$-quasi continuous on U.*

Proof. If u is $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi_2,V_2}$-quasi continuous, then u is $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi_1,V_1}$-quasi continuous by Lemma 3.13. Assume now that u is $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi_1,V_1}$-quasi continuous and let $K_n \subset U$ be an increasing sequence of compact sets such that $U = \bigcup_n K_n$. Since V_1 has the cutoff-property we let $\varphi_n \in V_1 \cap C_c(U)$ be a (K_n,U)-cutoff function and $\omega_n := \{x \in X_1 : \varphi_n(x) > 0\}$ be an open set. Then $K_n \subset \omega_n \subset\subset U$. By Lemma 3.11 there exists a constant C_n such that $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi_2,V_2}(A) \leq \psi_{2,1}(C_n \mathrm{Cap}_{\psi_1,V_1}(A))$ for all $A \subset w_n$. Hence u is $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi_2,V_2}$-quasi continuous on ω_n. Lemma 3.30 shows now that u is $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi_2,V_2}$-quasi continuous on U. ☐

Example 3.32. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be an open set. If $p \in (1,\infty)$ and $u \in \mathsf{u} \in \tilde{W}^{1,p}(\Omega)$ is a $\mathrm{Cap}_{p,\Omega}$-quasi continuous version of u, then u is Cap_p-quasi continuous on Ω.*

3.4. **Capacitary Extremals.** In this subsection we assume that X is a tms of type Θ, V is of class $\Upsilon(X)$ and ψ is V-admissible. Here we will prove existence and uniqueness of capacitary extremals.

Theorem 3.33. *Let $A \subset X$ and $\mathsf{u} \in V$ be non-negative. Then $\mathsf{u} \in \overline{\mathscr{Y}}_V(A)$ if and only if $\tilde{\mathsf{u}} \geq 1$ $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}$-q.e. on A.*

Proof. When $\tilde{\mathsf{u}} \geq 1$ $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}$-q.e. on A, then $\mathsf{u} \in \overline{\mathscr{Y}}_V(A)$ by Lemma 3.24. For the converse implication let $\mathsf{u} \in \overline{\mathscr{Y}}_V(A)$. By Theorem 3.29 there exists a sequence $(\mathsf{u}_n)_n \subset \mathscr{Y}_V(A)$ such that $\tilde{\mathsf{u}}_n \to \tilde{\mathsf{u}}$ $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}$-q.e. on X. For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists an open set O_n in X containing A such that $\mathsf{u}_n \geq 1$ μ-a.e. on O_n. Hence $\tilde{\mathsf{u}}_n \geq 1$ $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}$-q.e. on A by Theorem 3.26. This shows that $\tilde{\mathsf{u}} \geq 1$ $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}$-q.e. on A. ☐

Theorem 3.34. *For $A \subset X$ the Υ-capacity $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}$ of A is given by*

$$\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}(A) = \inf\Big\{\psi(\rho(\mathsf{u})) : \mathsf{u} \in \mathscr{V}, \mathsf{u} \geq 1\ \mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}\text{-q.e. on } A\Big\} \tag{4}$$

$$= \inf\Big\{\psi(\rho(\mathsf{u})) : \mathsf{u} \in V, \tilde{\mathsf{u}} \geq 1\ \mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}\text{-q.e. on } A\Big\}. \tag{5}$$

Proof. Let I denote the infimum on the right hand side of (5) and $\mathsf{u} \in \mathscr{Y}_V(A)$. Then by Theorem 3.33 we get that $\tilde{\mathsf{u}}^+ \geq 1$ $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}$-q.e. on A. Hence $I \leq \psi(\rho(\mathsf{u}^+)) \leq \psi(\rho(\mathsf{u}))$. Taking the infimum over all $\mathsf{u} \in \mathscr{Y}_V(A)$ we get that $I \leq \mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}(A)$. On the other hand, let $\mathsf{u} \in V$ be such that $\tilde{\mathsf{u}} \geq 1$ $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}$-q.e. on A. By Lemma 3.24 there exist $\mathsf{u}_n \in \mathscr{Y}_V(A)$ such that $\mathsf{u}_n \to \mathsf{u}^+$ in V. Hence $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}(A) \leq \psi(\rho(\mathsf{u}_n)) \to \psi(\rho(\mathsf{u}^+)) \leq \psi(\rho(\mathsf{u}))$. Taking the infimum over all such u gives that $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}(A) \leq I$ and hence we have equality. ☐

Definition 3.35. *A function* $\mathsf{u} \in \mathscr{V}$ *is called a/the* $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}$-extremal for $A \subset X$ *if* $\mathsf{u} \geq 1$ $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}$*-q.e on* A *and* $\psi(\rho((\mathsf{u})) = \mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}(A)$.

Theorem 3.36. *For every* $A \subset X$ *with* $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}(A) < \infty$ *there exists a* $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}$*-extremal* $\mathsf{e}_A \in \mathscr{V}$ *with* $0 \leq \mathsf{e}_A \leq 1$ $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}$*-q.e. on* X *and* $\mathsf{e}_A = 1$ $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}$*-q.e. on* A*. If in addition* ρ *is strictly convex, then* e_A *is unique.*

Proof. Let $\mathscr{Y}_V^+(A) := \{\mathsf{u} \in \mathscr{Y}_V(A) : \mathsf{u} = \mathsf{u}^+\}$. Since $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}(A) < \infty$ we have that $\mathscr{X} := \overline{\mathscr{Y}_V^+}(A)$ is a non-empty closed and convex subset of V. Let $(\mathsf{u}_n)_n \subset \mathscr{Y}_V^+(A)$ be such that $\psi(\rho(\mathsf{u}_n)) \to \mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}(A)$. Then the sequence $(\mathsf{u}_n)_n$ is bounded in the reflexive Banach space V and hence, by possibly passing to a subsequence, weakly convergent to a function $\mathsf{u} \in \mathscr{X}$. Using the weak lower semi-continuity of ρ we get that $\psi(\rho(\mathsf{u})) \leq \liminf_n \psi(\rho(\mathsf{u}_n)) = \mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}(A)$. Since $\psi(\rho(\mathsf{v})) \geq \mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}(A)$ for all $\mathsf{v} \in \mathscr{Y}_V^+(A)$ and hence for all $\mathsf{v} \in \mathscr{X}$ we get $\psi(\rho(\mathsf{u})) = \mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}(A)$. From Theorem 3.33 we get that $\mathsf{e}_A := \tilde{\mathsf{u}} \geq 1$ $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}$-q.e. on A. By possibly replacing e_A with $(se_A \wedge 1)^+$ the existence part is proved. Uniqueness follows from the strict convexity of ρ and from the fact that ψ is strictly increasing. $\square$

Remark 3.37. *The* $\mathrm{Cap}_{p,\Omega}$*-extremal for* $A \subset \overline{\Omega}$ *is the projection of* 0 *onto* $\overline{\mathscr{Y}}_{p,\Omega}(A)$.

4. VANISHING ’BOUNDARY’ VALUES

In this section we give an application of the Υ-capacity, namely to decide if a given function u lies in $W_0^{1,\Phi}(\Omega)$ or not. Here $\Phi \in \triangle_2 \cap \nabla_2$ is an $\mathscr{N}$-function and $W_0^{1,\Phi}(\Omega)$ is the closure of $W^{1,\Phi}(\Omega) \cap C_c(\Omega)$ in $W^{1,\Phi}(\Omega)$. We will assume in this section that X is a tms of type Θ which satisfies the *second axiom of countability*, V is of class $\Upsilon(X)$ and ψ is V-admissible and

(V7) $\mathsf{u}_n, \mathsf{v} \in V$, $\mathsf{u}_n \to \mathsf{u}$ in V implies that $\mathsf{u}_n \wedge \mathsf{v} \to \mathsf{u} \wedge \mathsf{v}$ in V.

Definition 4.1. *For* $\mathsf{u} \in V$ *we let* $\mathrm{supp}(\mathsf{u})$ *be the intersection of all closed sets* $A \subset X$ *such that* $\mathsf{u} = 0$ μ*-a.e. on* $X \setminus A$*. Note that* $O := X \setminus \mathrm{supp}(\mathsf{u})$ *is the largest open set in* X *such that* $\mathsf{u} = 0$ μ*-a.e. on* O*. For a set* $X_0 \subset X$ *we let* $V_c(X_0)$ *be the space consisting of all* $\mathsf{u} \in V$ *such that* $\mathrm{supp}(\mathsf{u}) \subset X_0$ *is compact and we let* $V_0(X_0)$ *be the closure of* $V_c(X_0)$ *in* V.

Theorem 4.2. *Let* $X_0 \subset X$ *be non-empty and assume that* $V_\infty := V \cap L^\infty(X,\mu)$ *with respect to the norm* $\|\mathsf{u}\|_{V_\infty} := \|\mathsf{u}\|_V + \|\mathsf{u}\|_{L^\infty}$ *is a Banach algebra and* V *has the cutoff-property. Then*

$$V_0(X_0) = \{\mathsf{u} \in V : \tilde{\mathsf{u}} = 0 \ \mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}\text{-}q.e. \text{ on } X \setminus X_0\}. \tag{6}$$

Proof. Let D_0 denote the right hand side of (6). First we show that $V_0(X_0) \subset D_0$. Let $\mathsf{u} \in V_0(X_0)$. Then there exists a sequence of functions $\mathsf{u}_n \in V_c$ such that $\mathsf{u}_n \to \mathsf{u}$ in V. By possibly passing to a subsequence (Theorem 3.29) we get that $(\tilde{\mathsf{u}}_n)_n$ converges $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}$-quasi everywhere to $\tilde{\mathsf{u}}$ and hence (Theorem 3.26) $\tilde{\mathsf{u}} = 0$ $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}$-quasi everywhere on $X \setminus X_0$, that is, $\mathsf{u} \in D_0$.

To show that $D_0 \subset V_0(X_0)$ we first consider a non-negative function $\mathsf{u} \in D_0 \cap L^\infty(X)$. Then there exists a sequence $(u_n)_n$ in $V \cap C_c(X)$ which converges to u in V. Since $(u_n \vee 0) \wedge \|\mathsf{u}\|_\infty$ converges also to u in V we may assume that $0 \leq u_n \leq \|\mathsf{u}\|_\infty$. Let $u \in \tilde{\mathsf{u}}$ be fixed. By possibly passing to a subsequence (Theorem 3.29) we get that for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists an open set G_m in X such that $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}(G_m) \leq 1/m$ and $u_n \to u$ uniformly on $X \setminus G_m$. Hence there exists $n_0 = n_0(m)$ such that $|u_{n_0} - u| \leq 1/(2m)$ everywhere on $X \setminus G_m$ and $\|u_{n_0} - \mathsf{u}\|_V \leq 1/m$. Let U_m be an open set in X such that $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}(U_m) \leq 1/m$ and $u = 0$ everywhere on $X \setminus (X_0 \cup U_m)$. Consequently, $|u_{n_0}| \leq 1/(2m)$ everywhere on $X \setminus (X_0 \cup O_m)$

where $O_m := G_m \cup U_m$. Let $\mathsf{e}_m \in \mathscr{V}$ be a $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}$-extremal for O_m (Theorem 3.36) and fix $e_m \in \mathsf{e}_m$. By possibly changing e_m on a $\mathrm{Cap}_{\psi,V}$-polar set we may assume that $e_m \equiv 1$ everywhere on O_m and $0 \leq e_m \leq 1$ everywhere on X. For $w_m := (u_{n_0} - 1/m)^+$ we have that $v_m := w_m(1-e_m) \in V_c$. In fact,

$$\mathrm{supp}(v_m) \subset \mathrm{supp}(w_m) \cap \mathrm{supp}(1-e_m) \subset \left\{x \in X : u_{n_0}(x) \geq 1/m\right\} \cap O_m^c \subset (X_0 \cup O_m) \cap O_m^c \subset X_0.$$

Since $v_m = w_m - w_m e_m$ is a bounded sequence in the reflexive Banach space $(V_0(X_0), \|\cdot\|_V)$, by possibly passing to a subsequence, we may assume that $v_m \rightharpoonup \mathsf{v} \in V_0(X_0)$. By Mazur's lemma [using that by possibly passing to a subsequence $v_m \to \mathsf{u}$ μ-a.e. and property (V3)] we get that $\mathsf{v} = \mathsf{u}$ μ-a.e. on X and hence $\mathsf{u} \in V_0(X_0)$. If $\mathsf{u} \in D_0 \cap L^\infty(X,\mu)$ is arbitrary, then we get by what we proved already that u^+ and u^- belong to $V_0(X_0)$ and hence $\mathsf{u} \in V_0(X_0)$. Finally, if $\mathsf{u} \in D_0$, then there exist $u_n \in V \cap C_c(X) \subset L^\infty(X,\mu)$ such that $u_n \to \mathsf{u}$ in V. Let $\mathsf{w}_n := (u_n \wedge \mathsf{u}^+) \vee (-\mathsf{u}^-) \in D_0 \cap L^\infty(X,\mu)$. Then $\mathsf{w}_n \in V_0(X_0)$ and hence $\mathsf{u} = \lim_n \mathsf{w}_n \in V_0(X_0)$ [property (V7)]. ☐

Definition 4.3. *Let Ω be an open and non-empty set in $\mathbb{R}^N$, $p \in (1,\infty)$ and $\Phi \in \triangle_2 \cap \nabla_2$ be an $\mathscr{N}$-function. Then we define $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ and $W^{1,\Phi}(\Omega)$ as the closure of $\mathscr{D}(\Omega)$ in $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ and $W^{1,\Phi}(\Omega)$, respectively.*

Corollary 4.4. *Let Ω be an open and non-empty set in $\mathbb{R}^N$, $p \in (1,\infty)$ and $\Phi \in \triangle_2 \cap \nabla_2$ be an $\mathscr{N}$-function. Then $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) = \left\{\mathsf{u} \in \tilde{W}^{1,p}(\Omega) : \tilde{\mathsf{u}} = 0 \ \mathrm{Cap}_{p,\Omega}\text{-q.e. on } \partial\Omega\right\}$ and $W_0^{1,\Phi}(\Omega) = \left\{\mathsf{u} \in \tilde{W}^{1,\Phi}(\Omega) : \tilde{\mathsf{u}} = 0 \ \mathrm{Cap}_{\Phi,\Omega}\text{-q.e. on } \partial\Omega\right\}$.*

To finish this section and the article we mention two further characterizations of $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$. The original proof of Theorem 4.5 is due to Havin [9] and Bagby [3], an alternative proof is given by Hedberg [10]. An other characterization, Theorem 4.6, was recently proved by David Swanson and William P. Ziemer [20, Theorem 2.2]. The main difference to Theorem 4.5 is that the function u was not assumed to belong to the space $W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$.

Theorem 4.5. *Let $1 < p < \infty$, $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ an open set and let $\mathsf{u} \in W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^N)$. Then $\mathsf{u} \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ if and only if $\lim_{r\to 0} r^{-N} \int_{B(x,r)} |u(y)|\, dy = 0$ for Cap_p-q.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega$.*

Theorem 4.6. . *Let $p \in (1,\infty)$ and $\mathsf{u} \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$. If $\lim_{r\to 0} r^{-N} \int_{\mathscr{B}(x,r)\cap\Omega} |\mathsf{u}(y)|\, dy = 0$ for Cap_p-quasi every $x \in \partial\Omega$, then $\mathsf{u} \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$.*

REFERENCES

[1] David R. Adams and Lars Inge Hedberg, *Function spaces and potential theory*, Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, vol. 314, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1996. MR 97j:46024

[2] Wolfgang Arendt and Mahamadi Warma, *The Laplacian with Robin boundary conditions on arbitrary domains*, Potential Anal. **19** (2003), no. 4, 341–363. MR 1 988 110

[3] Thomas Bagby, *Quasi topologies and rational approximation.*, J. Funct. Anal. **10** (1972), 259–268.

[4] Nicolas Bouleau and Francis Hirsch, *Dirichlet forms and analysis on Wiener space*, de Gruyter Studies in Mathematics, vol. 14, Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, 1991. MR MR1133391 (93e:60107)

[5] Haïm Brezis, *Analyse fonctionnelle*, Collection Mathématiques Appliquées pour la Maîtrise. [Collection of Applied Mathematics for the Master's Degree], Masson, Paris, 1983, Théorie et applications. [Theory and applications]. MR MR697382 (85a:46001)

[6] Gustave Choquet, *Theory of capacities.*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **5** (1954), 131–295.

[7] Lawrence C. Evans and Ronald F. Gariepy, *Measure theory and fine properties of functions*, Studies in Advanced Mathematics, CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, 1992. MR MR1158660 (93f:28001)

[8] Piotr Hajłasz, Pekka Koskela, and Heli Tuominen, *Sobolev embeddings, extensions and measure density condition*, J. Funct. Anal. **254** (2008), no. 5, 1217–1234. MR MR2386936

[9] Victor P. Havin, *Approximation in the mean by analytic functions*, Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR 9 (1968), 245–248.

[10] Lars Inge Hedberg, *Non-linear potentials and approximation in the mean by analytic functions.*, Math. Z. **129** (1972), 299–319.

[11] Juha Heinonen, Tero Kilpeläinen, and Olli Martio, *Nonlinear potential theory of degenerate elliptic equations*, Oxford Mathematical Monographs, Clarendon Press, New York, 1993. MR 94e:31003

[12] Henryk Hudzik and Paweł Kolwicz, *A note on P-convexity of Orlicz and Musielak-Orlicz spaces of Bochner type*, Function spaces (Poznań, 1998), Lecture Notes in Pure and Appl. Math., vol. 213, Dekker, New York, 2000, pp. 181–191. MR MR1772124 (2001i:46060)

[13] J. Malý, D. Swanson, and W. P. Ziemer, *Fine behavior of functions whose gradients are in an orlicz space*, Studia Math. **190(1)** (2009), 33–71.

[14] Jan Malý and William P. Ziemer, *Fine regularity of solutions of elliptic partial differential equations*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, vol. 51, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1997. MR MR1461542 (98h:35080)

[15] Vladimir G. Maz'ya, *Sobolev spaces*, Springer Series in Soviet Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1985, Translated from the Russian by T. O. Shaposhnikova. MR 87g:46056

[16] Julian Musielak, *Orlicz spaces and modular spaces*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1034, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1983. MR MR724434 (85m:46028)

[17] M. M. Rao and Z. D. Ren, *Theory of Orlicz spaces*, Monographs and Textbooks in Pure and Applied Mathematics, vol. 146, Marcel Dekker Inc., New York, 1991. MR MR1113700 (92e:46059)

[18] ______, *Applications of Orlicz spaces*, Monographs and Textbooks in Pure and Applied Mathematics, vol. 250, Marcel Dekker Inc., New York, 2002. MR MR1890178 (2003e:46041)

[19] P. Shvartsman, *On extensions of Sobolev functions defined on regular subsets of metric measure spaces*, J. Approx. Theory **144** (2007), no. 2, 139–161. MR MR2293385 (2007k:46057)

[20] David Swanson and William P. Ziemer, *Sobolev functions whose inner trace at the boundary is zero*, Ark. Mat. **37** (1999), no. 2, 373–380. MR 2000g:46048

E-mail address: `markus.biegert@uni-ulm.de`

(rvt) INSTITUTE OF APPLIED ANALYSIS, UNIVERSITY OF ULM, 89069 ULM, GERMANY